DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 463 EC 093 183

AUTHOR	Levy, Marguerite F.
TITLE	Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools (Part C). School Year 1975-1976. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	B/E-09-69698
PUB DATE	[76]
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Exceptional Child Research; *Individualized Instruction; *Mathematics; *Mentally Handicapped; *Paraprofessional Personnel; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction; Rehabilitation Centers; Remedial Programs; Special Programs; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Presented is an evaluation of a program providing mentally retarded students in two occupational training centers who were two or more years retarded in reading and/or mathematics with individual or small-group instruction supplementing the basic program. It is noted that 110 participants were given 2 hours, 15 minutes a week instructional time by paraprofessionals and teachers. An additional objective of the program is reported to have been providing for the training of paraprofessionals, workshops for paraprofessionals and teachers, and development of behavioral objectives and innovative teaching methods. Among findings listed are that all program objectives were met and that the program proved effective in meeting the needs of this population of students for individualized instruction. Recommendations include that the program be continued, that procedures be flexible to allow experimentation, and that time be allotted for informal discussions. Appended items include a pupil profile, progress report, and tabulated data. (IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136463

EVALUATION REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

B/E 09-69698

INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION FOR HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS

(Part C)

School Year 1975-1976

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Marguerite F. Levy, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-76 school year.

EC093183

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables..... ii

I. The Program
- Sites..... 1
- Staff..... 1
- Subjects..... 4
- Program Objectives..... 5

II. Evaluation Procedures
- Objectives..... 6

III. Findings
- Results of Data Analysis..... 7
- Pedagogical Methodology..... 9
- Facilities and Materials..... 10
- Discrepancy Analysis..... 10
- Recommendations of the 1974-1975 Evaluator..... 11
- Overview of Program Operation..... 14

IV. Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations
- Findings..... 16
- Conclusions..... 16
- Recommendations..... 17

V. Exemplary Program Abstract..... 19

Appendices
- Appendix A, Pupil Profile..... 20
- Appendix B, Progress Report..... 23
- Appendix C, Exemplary Letters..... 25
- MIR Table 11, Norm-Referenced Achievement Data..... 30
- MIR Data Loss Information..... 31

Chapter I

THE PROGRAM

The program, "Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools," B/E Function No. 09-69698 (ESEA Title I) was conducted from November 24, 1975 through June, 1976 at two facilities, involving three sites in the boroughs of Queens and Richmond in New York City.

Sites

Occupational Training Centers (P-721): Serving mentally retarded adolescents and adults, 17-21 years of age.

1. Queens Occupational Training Center, Corona
2. Queens Occupational Training Center Annex, Far Rockaway
3. Richmond Occupational Training Center, Staten Island

Staff

There were twelve staff members in Title I Component Positions on this project. The instructional staff consisted of eight Educational Assistants and two Teacher-Specialists. Table 1 indicates the distribution of instructional staff. In addition, a full-time Field Coordinator and full-time Secretary were assigned to cover this project and the project under Function No. 09-61695.

Table 1

Number of Instructional Personnel Assigned to Each Site, by Category

Site	Teachers	Educational Assistants
Queens, Corona	1	4*
Queens, Far Rockaway		1
Richmond	1	3

*One Bilingual

The Educational Assistants (Paraprofessionals) worked with individual students or with small groups under the direction of the Title I Teacher. In addition, Educational Assistants were responsible for the following:

1. Developing lessons and preparing materials under the Teacher's guidance.
2. Recording instructional activities and amount of time spent with each student.
3. Participating in in-service training.

Other duties associated with the program were assigned to the Educational Assistants by the Teachers as appropriate. Each paraprofessional was responsible for approximately 12 students.

The Teacher-Specialists (Para-trainers) had, in addition to their training in a specific handicap, special expertise in reading and mathematics. Each Teacher-Specialist structured the program at his/her particular school according to the needs of the students at that facility. The Teacher also coordinated the program with the Principal, in order to best complement the ongoing instructional program provided by tax-levy funds. Teacher-Specialists were responsible for:

1. Supervising all testing for the program.
2. Preparing Pupil Profiles (See Appendix A).
3. Selecting participants and scheduling participants.
4. Consulting with city tax-levy school personnel and articulating program with regular program.
5. Conducting a minimum of eight direct instructional periods a week.
6. Developing and implementing in-service training of paraprofessionals.
7. Developing and demonstrating lessons in target areas.
8. Carrying out necessary research and developing methods and materials appropriate for individualizing instruction for the particular kind of handicap dealt with.

9. Developing and/or refining behavioral objectives in reading and mathematics.
10. Record-keeping.
11. Preparing long-range instructional plans (Progress Reports, Appendix B).
12. Disseminating information on the program to school staff and parents through meetings or workshops.
13. Participating in the development of Criterion-Referenced Tests.

The Field Coordinator was responsible for:

1. Coordinating, supervising, and articulating the activities of the program with the city tax-levy program.
2. Supervising the development and implementation of the in-service training sessions for paraprofessionals at teaching sites.
3. Developing and implementing two-program wide workshops for all program paraprofessionals.
4. Providing workshops for professional growth and program planning for the two project teachers.
5. Supervising all of the detailed duties of the paraprofessionals and Teacher-Specialists.
6. Participating in the selection of program staff, in consultation with Principals.
7. Maintaining all financial and personnel records for the program.
8. Disseminating program information to all interested parties.
9. Visiting program sites and observing staff.

The School Secretary worked with the Project Coordinator, performing all secretarial functions relating to the record-keeping, reports, correspondence, payroll, preparation of supply orders, typing of workshop notes, and all other clerical duties.

The purpose of this program was to provide individual and small-group instruction in readiness skills (reading and mathematics readiness, auditory training, language development), reading and mathematics to handicapped Title I-eligible students attending special schools. Students were selected on the basis of scores on standardized tests in reading and mathematics to determine eligibility for this program. The guidelines for the program stipulate two or more years' retardation in reading or mathematics as the criterion for eligibility.

The project design indicated that 115 students would be included in the program. Data were collected on 127 students, and analyzed on 110. Table 2 indicates the distribution of students by facility, and summarizes the numbers and percentages of students for whom data were analyzed. The figures reported in the MIR forms are double the numbers because of requirements that data be analyzed separately by Component Code. As a result, students are listed twice.

Program

The Individualized Instruction Program was designed to support the City tax-levy program in Special Schools by supplementing the basic academic program in reading and mathematics through the provision of paraprofessionals and Teacher-Specialists.

Table 2

Distribution of Students in Program

Identification	Total number	Number analyzed	Percentage
Trainable mentally retarded			
Richmond OTC	10	10	100
Queens OTC	9	8	89
Total	19	18	95
Educable mentally retarded			
Richmond OTC	39	33	85
Queens OTC	69	59	86
Total	108	92	85
Grand Total	127	110	87

The Program Objectives were:

1. To help pupils achieve statistically significant improvement in reading and readiness skills.
2. To help pupils achieve statistically significant improvement in mathematics and readiness skills.

Each student received a minimum of three 45-minute periods (two hours, fifteen minutes) of instruction a week.

Chapter II
EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Evaluation Objective No. 1

To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, there is a statistically significant improvement in reading and readiness skills among Trainable Mentally Retarded pupils and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils in the program.

Method

The Wide Range Achievement Test (W.R.A.T.), 1965, Reading Subtest was administered on a pre/post basis to participants.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed separately for Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils. The difference between raw score means was tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated *t* test.

Time Schedule

Students were tested with the W.R.A.T. in December, 1975, and in May, 1976.

Evaluation Objective No. 2

To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, there is a statistically significant improvement in mathematics skills among Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils in the program.

Method

The Wide Range Achievement Test (W.R.A.T), 1965, Math Subtest was administered on a pre/post basis to participants.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed separately for Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils. The difference between raw score means was tested for statistical significance at the .05 level with the correlated *t* test.

Time Schedule

Students were tested with the W.R.A.T. in December, 1975, and in May, 1976.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

Results of Data Analysis

Evaluation Objective No. 1 was to determine if, as a result of the program, there is a statistically significant improvement in reading and readiness skills among the Trainable Mentally Retarded and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils in the program.

Data were analyzed separately for Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils. The correlated t test was used to determine the statistical significance of differences between raw-score means.

Table 3 indicates that there was statistically significant progress in reading among the Trainable Mentally Retarded students.

Table 3

Analysis of Reading Achievement
Trainable Mentally Retarded

Wide Range Achievement Test
(N=18)

Pretest			Post-test				
Date	Mean	S.D.	Date	Mean	S.D.	t	p<
12/75	33.95	15.20	5/76	38.84	13.18	3.59	.01

The difference between the pre and post-test scores was significant at the .01 level for the Trainable Mentally Retarded in reading.

The Educable Mentally Retarded also made significant progress in reading, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Analysis of Reading Achievement
Educable Mentally Retarded

Wide Range Achievement Test
(N=92)

Pretest			Post-test				
Date	Mean	S.D.	Date	Mean	S.D.	t	p<
12/75	42.41	11.88	5/76	45.65	11.73	7.09	.001

Evaluation Objective No. 2 was to determine if, as a result of the program, there is a statistically significant improvement in mathematics skills among the Trainable Mentally Retarded and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils in the program.

Data were analyzed separately for Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils. The correlated t test was used to determine the statistical significance of differences between raw-score means.

Table 5 indicates that there was statistically significant progress in mathematics among the Trainable Mentally Retarded pupils (.001 level).

Table 5

Analysis of Achievement in Mathematics
Trainable Mentally Retarded
Wide Range Achievement Test
(N=18)

Pretest			Post-test				
Date	Mean	S.D.	Date	Mean	S.D.	t	p <
12/75	18.50	4.73	5/76	22.50	3.67	6.86	.001

As indicated in Table 6, Educable Mentally Retarded pupils also made significant progress in mathematics (.001 level).

Table 6

Analysis of Achievement in Mathematics
Educable Mentally Retarded
Wide Range Achievement Test
(N=92

Pretest			Post-test				
Date	Mean	S.D.	Date	Mean	S.D.	t	p <
12/75	26.55	4.20	5/76	29.02	4.27	8.19	.001

Evaluation Objective No. 3 was to determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The program was carried out as described in the Project Proposal.

Staff

Although there was a change in mid-year from the original Project Coordinator to a new Project Coordinator, the program was not adversely affected, since both were exceptionally capable, concerned educators and administrators. Also, thanks to the efficiency of the Program Secretary, the problems of transition were minimal.

The Teacher-Specialists are of superior calibre. The Educational Assistants are also exceptional, each, in different ways, having special areas of competence in teaching and relating to this extremely handicapped population of students. The Teacher-Specialists are actively involved in learning new ways to reach these students. Most of the instructional staff spend their own time developing materials, studying techniques, and searching for ways in which they can more effectively serve their students. They are a truly remarkable group, working extra hours and contributing much more than they are compensated for in terms of salary.

Pedagogical Methodology

The general approach to teaching readiness skills, reading, and mathematics was diagnostic and prescriptive. Educational Assistants and Teacher-Specialists were used to provide small-group or individual instruction, to supplement the regular City tax-levy program in reading and mathematics.

In addition to the testing program stipulated for the formal analysis, optional diagnostic tests were administered at the discretion of the on-site Title I teacher, as needed, and varied according to the handicap of the pupil.

Each pupil also received a battery of tests developed by a Dade County, Florida, Title III dissemination project. The Dade County Test measures pre-reading skills in the following areas: visual and auditory memory, visual and auditory discrimination, and visual-motor skills. As a further aid to diagnosis, an informal assessment of relevant physical, social, and emotional factors was prepared. During the first two weeks of a student's participation in the program, the foregoing information was incorporated in a Pupil Profile, to assist the Teacher in the preparation of long-range learning objectives based on the modality strengths of each student.

Teacher-Specialists provided lessons and guidance to the Educational Assistants, supervised classification of available material by skill and modality, and created new materials as necessary. Both the Teacher-Specialists and the Educational Assistants provided individual and small-group instruction in skill areas appropriate for the particular pupil. The program varied in specific details to meet the different needs of students with multiple handicaps.

Students were scheduled for regular periods in a special room provided for the Program, where individuals or small groups of trainees received instruction in reading and mathematics from the Educational Assistants and Teacher (who thus was also able to directly supervise the paraprofessionals).

Facilities and Materials

The facilities and materials were generally excellent.

Discrepancy Analysis

The program is definitely serving the needs of the target population for which it was designed, namely providing individual and small-group instruction in readiness skills, reading and mathematics to handicapped, Title I-eligible students attending special schools, who are two or more years retarded in reading and/or mathematics.

No discrepancies were found in the program, but it should be noted that the late funding of the program (November 24, 1975) led to an unusually long interval in which the pupils were not receiving special instruction. Since there is always some regression on the part of many participants as a result of the summer vacation, this was accentuated by the additional lapse of time resulting from the late funding. This is especially important in a population of mentally retarded pupils, where consolidation and retention of learning is a major problem.

Recommendations of the 1974-1975 Evaluator

1. This program should be recycled because it provided necessary supportive services for special children which would otherwise be unavailable.
2. The paraprofessional trainer role should be continued with active involvement of the para trainer in teaching, on-site teaching demonstrations, diagnosis of reading problems and instructional prescriptions. A full-time para trainer should be provided to each Occupational Training Center.
3. Diagnostic and prescriptive programmming for program participants should be improved to include the following:
   a. An individual profile for each of the participants should be developed, and records should be kept indicating information such as: family history, school attendance, intellectual level (retarded population), achievement data, participation in special programs used for instruction and any other relevant data which would assist in planning optimal instruction.
   b. In order to provide effective diagnosis and ongoing prescription, it is strongly recommended that para trainers schedule case conferences with supportive personnel (psychologist, guidance counselor, social worker, attendance teacher, etc.), with a minimum of three conferences during the academic year (September-October, January-February, May-June).

4. The curriculum objectives developed during the 1974-1975 school year for mentally retarded children should be implemented in the program for 1975-1976. There should be ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the objectives in guiding instruction during the 1975-1976 school year.
5. Schools for handicapped children in which paras are placed should provide the field coordinator, para trainers and paras in that setting with specific curriculum objectives in reading and math for the handicapped population.
6. Work should be continued on criterion-referenced tests appropriate for administration to the handicapped child.
7. The role of the field coordinator should be continued and expanded. In order to provide competent personnel for this special population personnel hired for the program should be approved by the field coordinator responsible for supervision of the program.
8. Training workshops should be expanded to include funds for outside consultants with expertise within the various handicap areas such as learning disabilities and reading and math specialists.

All of the recommendations of the previous evaluator were implemented during the 1975-1976 school year, with the exception of Recommendation No. 3b. The program was not in operation in September-October, so that no case conferences could be scheduled during those months.

Some problems did arise as a result of implementation of some of these recommendations, and these are discussed below.

Efforts to implement Recommendation No. 3a, and also Recommendation No. 4, led to use of the Dade County Program Materials (described under Pedagogical Methodology) as a diagnostic tool and to develop behavioral objectives. One purpose was to use perceptual screening and training to permit utilization of the strongest learning modalities of each student in teaching reading and mathematics. Another purpose was to develop behavioral objectives for perceptual development based on diagnostic testing. Use of the Dade County Test

on all pupils was extremely burdensome and time-consuming. The test was also inappropriate for use with many students. Scoring procedures on the Dade are highly subjective, making inter-rater reliability extremely low, so that pupils' scores cannot be compared across raters. The Dade County Program does appear to be useful as a diagnostic tool for selected students, and Teacher-Specialists recommended that it be used at their option in special cases. Similarly, although the test is useful in helping to develop behavioral objectives, it is not necessary that it be administered to all students for this purpose.

Also in order to comply with Recommendation No. 3, a mandatory Pupil Profile was prescribed for all participants. The form appears to be unnecessarily detailed and serves little purpose, while adding to the amount of time spent on paperwork. Although the form is sometimes useful in bringing to the attention of Educational Assistants the special needs of particular students, each site should be permitted to develop its own form (if one is deemed needed), since, in many cases, all or much of the information duplicated what was already available in existing records at the site.

With regard to Recommendation No. 4, Teacher-Specialists devoted a great deal of time (much of it their own) to the development and evaluation of behavioral objectives. This is a highly demanding, specialized task, and the Teacher-Specialists should not be expected to carry it out along with their regular assignments. The Project Coordinator plans to arrange for the collation and printing of the items that have been developed and piloted, in order that this important work may be more widely disseminated. The principals at some of the Occupational Training Centers have been cooperative in providing printing assistance in developing these objectives.

With regard to Recommendation No. 6, although there was ongoing work on developing appropriate criterion-referenced tests, this is still a problem,

since most tests are not suited to the special needs of this population. Some extremely important progress with pupils is not formally recognized, since it cannot be demonstrated through the available tests. For example, many students who have never communicated, or whose communications were unintelligible, learn to express meanings and to speak intelligibly. This type of progress, which moves a student into a new stage of learning which is fundamental to further learning, although it is strikingly apparent in the pupil's changed behavior, is not reflected in formal test scores.

Efforts to implement Recommendation No. 7 also led to increased paperwork for instructional staff, since regular reports were instituted, such as Monthly Progress Reports. Teacher-Specialists found planning sessions, in which they could discuss common problems and solutions, valuable.

With regard to Recommendation No. 8, reactions to the workshops were mixed. Some workshops were considered to be extremely helpful, while others were not, depending upon the perceived relevance of the content to the instructional staff.

Overview of Program Operation

The members of the program staff at all levels were highly motivated, intensely involved, individuals. As a result, the program, despite the diversity of students, and the late funding, succeeded beyond expectations.

The staff enthusiasm was reflected in the students' attitudes. The evaluator frequently observed retarded students turn away in disappointment after erroneously coming to the program on a day when they were not scheduled for instruction. Most of the students leave their sessions reluctantly to return to regular classes.

The evaluator's discussions with and observations of City tax-levy teachers and administrators also indicated positive attitudes toward the program. They expressed high approval, and wished to see it augmented with additional staff.

The major contribution of the program is probably in those aspects which are not reflected in the formal objectives related to academic achievement. For

all of the students, the excellent rapport established by the instructional staff not only facilitates learning of reading and mathematics, but enhances the pupils' self-esteem. The importance of this aspect can not be exaggerated, since most of these students have suffered tremendous personal rejection throughout their lives, and the self-confidence emerging as a result of the unaccustomed positive interest and encouragement opens them to seeking better communication with others. They begin to participate in new activities and gain further self-confidence. The evaluator has seen a number of students in whom there were truly remarkable changes over a few months. The importance of these personality changes can not be overemphasized, since the students become increasingly receptive to learning as a result of their new feelings of self-worth.

There is also, in addition to the learning reflected in the test results, a great deal of functional learning. The functional training also can not be assessed by standardized tests, but is extremely important, since it enables students to function more adequately outside the sheltered environment of the school. It means that the student is better able to find his way around by himself, to understand signs, avoid getting into difficulties or dangers, and generally be acceptable to others. The student learns, in other words, many routine things which enable him to cope more adequately in recurring situations which make no provision for handicapped individuals.

These social and emotional gains are undoubtedly more important to the pupils and to society than the remarkable academic gains reflected in the formal test results. This opinion is shared by others, as can be seen in the letters from school personnel and parents, examples of which are included as Appendix C.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The program, "Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools," B/E Function No. 09-69698 (ESEA Title I), was conducted from November, 1975 through June, 1976 at two educational facilities, involving three sites in the boroughs of Queens and Richmond in New York City.

There were twelve staff members provided in the program. The instructional staff consisted of eight Educational Assistants and two Teacher-Specialists. There was also a Project Coordinator and Secretary assigned full time to this project and to Project 09-61695.

A total of 127 students participated in the program. Complete data were collected for 110 participants.

Findings

Objective No. 1 was achieved in that, as a result of participation in this program, there was a statistically significant improvement in reading and readiness skills among Trainable Mentally Retarded pupils and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils between the pre and post-test scores on the W.R.A.T.

Objective No. 2 was achieved in that, as a result of participation in this program, there was a statistically significant improvement in mathematics skills among Trainable and Educable Mentally Retarded pupils in the program between the pre and post-test scores on the W.R.A.T.

Objective No. 3 was achieved, in that the program as actually carried out coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal, despite late funding.

Conclusions

The program was extremely effective in meeting the needs of this population of students for individualized instruction.

The staff is highly qualified and strongly motivated to develop and use the most effective approaches possible to teaching these special students. Although there are many common types of problems, special adaptations of methodology are required for different students. It is is therefore concluded that the overall program requirements should be as flexible as possible to permit innovative approaches at the various sites. The staff at any particular site has special knowledge of the students and their problems, and this expertise should be used to fullest advantage in the program.

It was also concluded that requirements for the regular submission of detailed reports should be kept to a minimum, since the time spent on paperwork could be more effectively used in creative work on teaching methods.

The Dade County Program is useful as an ancillary test, but does not provide sufficient information on most students to warrant the time it consumes. It should be available to Teacher-Specialists for use in special cases at their discretion.

Available tests do not adequately reflect the full extent of progress achieved by students in the program, particularly among those students with severe language deficiencies.

Recommendations

1. This program should be continued, since it provides special services to handicappped pupils who require individualized instruction, and this instruction would otherwise be unavailable to them.
2. Use of the Dade County Program should be optional, rather than mandatory.
3. Procedures should be as flexible as possible to permit experimentation and innovation at different sites, in view of the divergent types of students, and unusually qualified and motivated instructional staff.

4. Some of the time now allotted to formal workshops should be made available for informal discussion of problems and approaches among the instructional staff.
5. Work should continue on developing appropriate measures of student progress.
6. One exceptionally well-qualified Teacher-Specialist should be assigned on a full-time basis for a minimum of one year to develop behavioral objectives.

Chapter V

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The program, "Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools," involved the following components: 6086141, 6086142, 6096141, and 6096142, under Activity Code 722. The program was conducted from November 24, 1975 until June, 1976 in two educational facilities. Staff consisted of eight Educational Assistants and two Teacher-Specialists. There was also a Project Coordinator and Secretary assigned full time to this project and to Project 09-61695.

Mentally retarded students in Occupational Training Centers who were two or more years' retarded in reading and/or mathematics were given individual or small-group instruction by paraprofessionals and teachers to supplement the basic academic program in reading and mathematics. The amount of instructional time was two hours, fifteen minutes a week. Data on 110 participants were analyzed.

The program also provided for the training of paraprofessionals, workshops for paraprofessionals and teachers, development of behavioral objectives, and innovative teaching methods.

All program objectives were achieved, and significant gains were found between scores on pretest and post-test in reading and mathematics.

The evaluator strongly recommended continuation of the program, since it is effectively meeting needs of special children, which would otherwise remain unmet.

APPENDIX A

Paula Silverman
Project Coordinator

O T C PUPIL PROFILE

Name _____

Address _____ Tel. # _____

Date of Birth _____ Age _____

Social Security # _____

Fathers Name _____

Mothers Name _____

Name of person with whom trainee lives if other than parents:

_____ Relationship _____

Language Spoken at home _____

EDUCATION HISTORY

Years in School _____ Years in Special Ed. classes _____

Specify class _____

Years in other settings (Name) _____

STANDARDIZED TESTING

	Name	Date	Raw Score	Grade Equiv.
Reading-Pretest				
Post test				
Math - Pretest				
Post test				

OPTIONAL DIAGNOSTIC TESTING

	Date	Diagnosis	Prescription
Roswell Chall			
Wepman Auditory			
Key Math (American Guidance Assoc.)			

O T C PUPIL PROFILE

OPTIONAL DIAGNOSTIC TESTING (Cont'd)

	Date	Diagnosis	Prescription
Gilmore Oral			
Huelsman Word Discrimination			
FOLLOW-UP			

INFORMAL READING ASSESSMENT (Dade County Tests)

	Diagnosis	Prescription
1.Auditory memory & sequencing		
2.Visual memory & sequencing		
3.Perceptual motor		
4.Auditory Perception		
5.Visual Perception		
FOLLOW-UP		

O T C PUPIL PROFILE

	Yes	No	Comments
Physical Characteristics			
1. Adequate vision.			
2. Wears glasses			
3. Adequate hearing. (If not please comment.)			
4. Other physical disability.			
5. Health problems-medication			
Speech & Language			
1. Speech impediment.			
2. Adequate English communication.			
3. Speaks another language.			
Social-Emotional Development			
1. Gets along with peers.			
2. Gets along with adults & authority figures.			
3. Adequate frustration tolerance.			
Behavioral Characteristics			
1. Adequate attention span.			
2. Follows directions.			
3. Exhibits hyperactivity.			
4. Easily distractable.			
5. Lethargic.			
6. Needs direct supervision.			

INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION FOR
HANDICAPPED STUDENTS IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX B

1975 - 1976 Function #09-61696

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINERS

(This report is to be submitted to the Project Coordinator during the first week of the month starting in October. The report for September is due September 16th.)

NAME _____ Date _____ School _____

1. Indicate what your goals are for this month with reference to paraprofessional training and individualization of instruction for the students.

2. Indicate how you plan to meet the goals stated above giving details and attaching copies of all written materials developed by you for this purpose, i.e. group workshops for paras, demonstration lessons, films or other training devices.

3. Indicate next to the name of each of your paraprofessionals your appraisal and comments regarding the growth of the paraprofessional with regard to individualized instruction.

4. Describe briefly what your long-range plans are with regard to paraprofessional training and/or the instructional program for next month.

5. Indicate any problems, if any, which have arisen at your site with regard to the program and describe the action you have taken to solve them.

APPENDIX C

QUEENS
OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTER
41-15 104TH STREET P.S. 721
CORONA, N.Y. 11368

BLANCHE FIERSTEIN, Principal

Tel. HA 4-8584

6-9-76

To Whom It May Concern:

As the acting assistant principal of the Queens O.T.C., I have had many opportunities to observe the Title I program. Despite its late start, it has proven to be very successful. The achievements for only five months were remarkable and the attitude of the trainees was very positive. Every trainee at the Q.O.T.C has asked to be scheduled for this program next year.

This program has shown that depressed handicapped children have the ability to succeed academically if given the environment they need — a one to one situation and learning objectives that are prescribed. It would be pathetic if this program were curtailed in anyway.

Yours truly,
E Brodkin

June 4, 1976

Ms. Pace

I have just learned that the present reading program at the O.T.C. might be cancelled due to the budget Crunch

I consider this an outrage because our trainees need whatever they can get in the way of academic work.

I know my daughter Nancy did benefit from this program and I strongly urge that whatever must be done, be done in order to continue this needed program.

Sincerely
(Mrs.) Elsie Mongo

Mrs. Sharon Pace
Teacher in Charge
Reading Program
Queens Occupational Training Center

Dear Mrs. Pace

I urge the continuation of the Reading Program at Queens OTC.

My daughter, who participates in the program, has displayed a renewed interest in reading since being included in the class. I feel that the discontinuance of these classes would cause a back-slide in this interest and her general ability.

I sincerely hope that funds will be available to continue and expand this program.

Yours very truly

Veronica H. O'Reilly

Veronica H. O'Reilly
3551 95th Street
Jackson Heights, N.Y.

June 5, 1970

QUEENS
OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTER
41-15 104TH STREET P.S. 721
CORONA, N.Y. 11368

BLANCHE FIERSTEIN, Principal Tel. HA 4-8584

June 4, 1976

Dear Mrs. Lace,

The trainees that participated in the reading program have been more motivated to perform in their shops. The program is a definite asset to their growth and development. They liked it and progress is obvious in all that took part in it.

Sincerely
S. Fields

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | c | 7 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 3 | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): | 0 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 8 |

Project Title Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools

School District Name District 75--Special Education Schools

School District Address Room 227, 110 Livingston St., Brooklyn, New York 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Marguerite F. Levy, Ph.D.

Title Consultant-Evaluator

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 858-8988

Date this form was completed 6 / 11 / 76 .

B/E Function #09-69698 Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools

Table 11 Norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 9.

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project component/activities in achieving cognitive objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	N 4/	Score Type 5/	Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data	
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post					Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	Date	Mean	6/ S.D.	7/ Test	8/ Value
6 0 8 6 1 4 1	7 2 2	WRAT-65	Reading				19	61	18	6	Dec. 75	33.95	15.2	5/76	38.84	13.2	Corr. t	3.59
6 0 9 6 1 4 1	7 2 2	WRAT-65	Mathematics				19	61	18	6	Dec. 75	18.50	4.7	5/76	22.50	3.7	Corr. t	6.86
6 0 8 6 1 4 2	7 2 2	WRAT-65	Reading				108	61	92	6	Dec. 75	42.41	11.9	5/76	45.65	11.7	Corr. t	7.09
6 0 9 6 1 4 2	7 2 2	WRAT-65	Mathematics				108	61	92	6	Dec. 75	26.55	4.2	5/76	29.02	4.3	Corr. t	8.19

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the 4th and 5th digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants for whom both pre and post test data are provided.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = publisher's standard score; 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ Standard Deviation - only required of the following districts: Albany, Buffalo, Hempstead, Mount Vernon, New York City, Niagara Falls, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Yonkers.

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value of test statistic (e.g. F=13.25

34

33

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to NARRATIVE) Function # B/E 09-69698 Individualized Instruction for Handicapped Students in Special Schools

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed	
						N	%		Number
60861417	722	61	WRAT-65	19	18	1	5	Working	1
60961417	722	61	WRAT-65	19	18	1	5	Working	1
60861427	722	61	WRAT-65	108	92	16	15	Absent Discharged Moved Transferred from program Working	4 6 2 3 1
60961427	722	61	WRAT-65	108	92	16	15	Absent Discharged Moved Transferred from program Working	4 6 2 3 1

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (PIAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.)

(3) Number of participants in the activity.

(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.

(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.